

REMARKS

The final Office action mailed on 29 July 2004 (Paper No. 0704) has been carefully considered. Allowance of claims 18 thru 31 is appreciated.

Claims 1 thru 8 and 32 thru 35 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 9, 12 and 18 are being amended. Thus, claims 9 thru 31 are pending in the application.

In paragraph 2 of the final Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 thru 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102 for alleged anticipation by Hanak, U.S. Patent No. 4,157,215. In paragraph 4 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 for alleged unpatentability over Hanak '215. In paragraph 6 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 9 thru 12 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Lee *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,479,928. In paragraph 7 of the Office action, the Examiner objected to claims 13 thru 17 for dependency upon a rejected base claim, but stated that these claims would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. For the reasons stated below, it is submitted that the invention recited in the claims, as now amended, is distinguishable from the prior art cited by the Examiner so as to preclude rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1 thru 6, those claims are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 no longer apply, and should be withdrawn.

With respect to the “double patenting” rejection of claims 9 thru 12, a terminal disclaimer is being submitted herewith, and claims 9 and 12 are being amended merely to improve form. Therefore, the rejection for obviousness-type double patenting no longer applies, and should be withdrawn.

Finally, allowed claim 18 is being amended to improve form. Therefore, allowance of claims 18 thru 31 is still appropriate.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance, and early issuance thereof is solicited. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56537
Date: 10/29/04
I.D.: REB/JGS